

REMARKS

This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated August 24, 2010 is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-17, 19-22 and 24-38 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 5, 17, 19, 21, 35, 36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski (US 2002/0188959) in view of Kuzma (US 5,889,950) and further in view of Eng (US 5,963,557).

In response to Applicant's arguments that Piotrowski does not teach or suggest the claimed "multimedia document generator/transmitter, which generates and transmits a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value," the Examiner asserts that Piotrowski teaches this aspect of the invention at paragraphs [0024] and [30-40].

Piotrowski discloses supplemental multimedia information 13 which can include additional audio sound tracks 15 and visual information 16 for a video/multimedia program 14. See paragraph [0024]. Further, Piotrowski discloses that using SMIL, media components are named for text, images, audio and video with URLs and to schedule their presentation in parallel or in sequence. See paragraph [0032]. The components have different media types and the begin and end times of different components are specified relative to events in other media components.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed multimedia document generator/transmitter, which generates and transmits a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value (the reference clock generator/transmitter, generates and transmits a reference clock value, which is a current time value of real-time multimedia broadcasting at the transmission and reception locations). Piotrowski merely discloses that begin and end times of different components are specified relative to events in other media components.

Furthermore, in the interest of moving prosecution forward, Applicant requests that the Examiner particularly identify which element (for example, by providing an element number or description) of Piotrowski teaches the claimed multimedia document generator/transmitter and the generated reference clock value. Further, Applicant requests that the Examiner more particularly identify (e.g., by citing a specific line in the paragraphs cited by the Examiner) where Piotrowski teaches the claimed multimedia document generator/transmitter, which generates and transmits a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Kuzma teaches a national or local source and the broadcaster uses time stamps included in a script to schedule the generation and transmission of a web page. The Examiner reasons that when the current time matches the scheduled broadcasting time, the document is generated and transmitted.

Kuzma is directed to scripting broadcast data relating to television programs and web pages. See col. 1, lines 5-10. Local affiliate networks who receive broadcast television material from a national source can insert local advertisements and programming at certain time slots

during re-transmission of the broadcast material. See col. 1, lines 34-37. Local affiliates would like to determine when a national resource is broadcasting a web page, how many pages are being broadcast at a time and the content of the pages. See col. 2, lines 18-23.

The aspects of Kuzma cited by the Examiner describe encoding HTML web pages into a format compatible with signals of a first location. A time stamp is provided as a time reference as to when a program or web page is to be broadcast. A local affiliate may use the time stamp to determine when it may insert local programming.

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Kuzma does not cure the deficiencies of Piotrowski. The time stamp, which the Examiner cites for teaching the claimed reference clock value, provides a time reference as to when a program or web page is to be broadcast. The time stamp does not teach or suggest a current time value of real-time multimedia broadcasting at the transmission and reception locations. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of generating and transmitting a multimedia document (SMIL document) scheduled at the generated reference clock value.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Piotrowski clearly states building a SMIL multimedia document using various types of multimedia files.

An exemplary embodiment of the invention generates and transmits a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value, and generates and transmits media data used to render the generated multimedia document. Specifically, a multimedia document generator/transmitter, generates and transmits a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value and a media data generator/transmitter, generates and transmits media data

used to render the generated multimedia document. Therefore, the multimedia document and the media data are distinctly different elements. Accordingly, both the multimedia document and the media data, which are generated by distinctly different elements, cannot correspond to the supplemental multimedia information of Piotrowski.

Furthermore, the video/TV program 14 is one-way broadcasting because it is one of many television programs broadcast or transmitted to the public. The supplemental multimedia information 13 is **one-way broadcasting** because it is only supplemental information subordinate to video/TV program 14.

However, the claimed invention realizes two-way broadcasting, i.e., interactive broadcasting by generating and transmitting a reference clock value of real-time multimedia broadcasting, and then generating and transmitting a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value and then generating and transmitting media data used to render the generated multimedia document.

Merely because Piotrowski discloses double arrows from the SMIL documents and the PC and the SMIL documents and the intranet enabled device, does not teach the two-way broadcasting, i.e., interactive broadcasting by generating and transmitting a reference clock value of real-time multimedia broadcasting, and then generating and transmitting a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value and then generating and transmitting media data used to render the generated multimedia document.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

To the extent independent claims 6, 16, 17, 22, 32 and 33 recite similar subject matter, independent claims 6, 16, 17, 22, 32 and 33 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

II. Rejection of claims 6, 8, 10-15, 22, 24, 26-31, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6, 8, 10-15, 22, 24, 26-31, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski in view of Blackketter (US 6,415,438) and further in view of Eng.

As indicated above, to the extent independent claims 6 and 22 recite subject matter similar to claim 1, claims 6 and 22 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons. Moreover, Eng does not cure the deficiencies of Piotrowski and Blackketter.

Claims 8, 10-15, 24, 26-31, and 37 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependent to independent claims 6 and 22.

Further, Blackketter discloses an interactive television trigger which has a time attribute value which indicates a future time when the trigger is to be executed. See abstract. A receiver unit determines the future time from the time attribute and waits until the indicated future time. At the indicated future time, the receiver unit executes the trigger. See column 4, lines 56-60. The trigger can indicate a year, a month and a day. A time attribute value “T” indicates a wall-

clock date and time. See column 5, lines 7-20. The received unit maintains an indication of the current date and time. See column 5, lines 22-30.

Blackketter discloses broadcasting the current date and time to the receiver so that the receiver, such as a WebTV[®] can maintain a current date and time. Assuming *arguendo*, Blackketter teaches a reference clock generator/transmitter, there is no teaching or suggestion of generating and transmitting a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value, as recited in claim 1 (a multimedia document generator/transmitter, which generates and transmits a multimedia document scheduled at the generated reference clock value).

III. Rejection of claims 16 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski in view of Kuzma in view of Blackketter and further in view of Eng.

To the extent claims 16 and 32 recite subject matter similar to claim 1, they should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, Blackketter does not cure the deficiencies of Piotrowski, Kuzma and Eng.

IV. Rejection of claims 4, 20, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 20, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski in view of Kuzma in view of Eng and further in view of the Real-Time Streaming Protocol Specification (RFC 2326).

Claims 4 and 20 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to independent claims 1 and 17 for at least the reasons set forth above. To the extent independent claim 33 recites subject matter similar to claim 1, claim 33 and its dependent claim 34 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons. Moreover, RFC 2326 does not cure the deficiencies of Piotrowski, Kuzma and Eng.

V. Rejection of claims 9 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski in view of Blackketter in view of Eng and further in view of the Real-Time Streaming Protocol Specification (RFC 2326).

Claims 9 and 25 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 6 and 22 for at least the reasons set forth above. Further, RFC 2326 does not cure the deficiencies of Piotrowski, Blackketter and Eng.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/629,717

Attorney Docket No.: Q76376

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 25, 2010